



2841

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

~~Christian~~ RUQUE

~~Appln.~~ No.: 09/628,442

Confirmation No.: Not yet known

Group Art Unit: 2841

~~Filed:~~ July 28, 2000

Examiner: T. Dinh

~~For:~~ A DEVICE FOR PROTECTING A DRAWER ELECTROMAGNETICALLY

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated May 8, 2001, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please enter the following amended claims:

1. (Amended) A device for electromagnetically protecting a drawer equipped with electronics cards, said drawer suitable for being inserted into a drawer-receiving structure through an opening provided in a front face of said drawer-receiving structure, said device comprising six faces distributed around said cards, wherein one of said faces of said device is formed by a front face of said drawer, while the five other faces of said device are formed by two side faces, a top face, a bottom face, and a back face of said drawer-receiving structure, said faces being electrically conductive.

3. (Amended) A device according to claim 2, wherein said resilient electrical connection

A2  
cont'd  
Sub A1

means are formed by electrically-conductive springs disposed on edges of said opening provided in the front face of the structure, and/or on said drawer.

4. (Amended) A device according to claim 1, wherein at least one of said faces is provided with openings for allowing air to flow through and/or for allowing electrical cables to pass through.

8. (Amended) A device according to claim 4, wherein a maximum linear dimension of said openings is considerably smaller than a minimum wavelength of electromagnetic waves from which said drawer is to be isolated.

A3

9. (Amended) A device according to claim 1, wherein said structure is suitable for receiving a plurality of drawers, wherein drawer-receiving recesses for two adjacent drawers are separated by an intermediate electrically-conductive plate suitable for creating electromagnetic isolation between said two recesses.

10. (Amended) A device according to claim 9, wherein said intermediate plate is provided with openings for allowing air to flow through and/or for enabling electrical cables to pass through, and wherein said intermediate plate carries resilient means for establishing electrical connection with the front faces of drawers received in said two recesses.

**IN THE ABSTRACT:**

**Please delete the present Abstract of the Disclosure and replace it with the following new Abstract of the Disclosure.**

**ABSTRACT**

ALL  
For a drawer, equipped with electronics cards and inserted into a drawer-receiving structure through an opening provided in the front face of the drawer-receiving structure, a device for electromagnetically protecting the cards is formed by the front face of the drawer, and by the side faces, the top face, the bottom face, and the back face of the drawer-receiving structure, the faces being electrically conductive.

---

### REMARKS

A substitute Abstract is provided. The claims are herein amended to address informalities including those objected-to on page 2 of the present action (Paper No. 6). It is believed that the claim amendments obviate all of the Examiner's objections. Applicant notes that the objection to claim 5 refers to limitations not in the subject claim. It is submitted that the claim amendments are essentially non-substantive and are directed only to formal matters.

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

- Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Brusati et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,467,254). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The applied *Brusati* reference fails to teach or suggest a drawer, a drawer-receiving structure, or six faces distributed around the cards in the drawer, where one face is formed by a front face of the drawer and the other five faces are formed by the sides, top, bottom, and back of the drawer-receiving structure, as claimed in claim 1.

Rather, *Brusati* discloses a chassis 84 having guides 38 for holding circuit cards 88 (e.g., column 5: lines 6-7, 10-11; Fig. 6). The guides 38 are formed of an elongated track 50 and a grounding strip 40 (e.g., Fig. 3). When a circuit card 88 is inserted into the slot 38, leaf springs 42 on the grounding strip 40 are connected to the backing plate 92 (ground) on the circuit card, thereby grounding the backing plate 92 of the circuit card 88 to the chassis 84 (e.g., Title; Abstract; col. 3: lines 12-15). Figure 6 therein shows a circuit card in a chassis (e.g., col. 3: line 36).

By comparison, the above-described *Brusati* disclosure does not teach or suggest any of the above-noted limitations of subject claim 1. Specifically, a chassis 84 is not a drawer that is suitable for being inserted into a drawer-receiving structure. The terms "chassis" and "drawer"

are not given any special meanings in either the present application or in the *Brusati* reference, and the *Brusati* chassis is not a drawer. Moreover, the *Brusati* disclosure does not in any way teach or suggest a drawer having a front face or a drawer-receiving structure having five faces that are distributed around the electronics cards, and the Examiner has not alleged same. The Examiner must identify what elements in *Brusati* he considers to be the “six faces” as claimed in claim 1, and which element of *Brusati* he considers to be a “drawer-receiving structure.”

To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim. MPEP § 2131 (case citation omitted). In our case, the ground of rejection does not assert or identify all the elements and limitations of subject claim 1 (all-elements rule), and the present § 102 rejection falls far short of meeting the Examiner’s initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* case.

Since the applied reference does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, Applicant respectfully requests the § 102 rejection of claims 1-3 be withdrawn. Claims 2 and 3 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1.

- Claims 4-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brusati* in view of *Porter* (U.S. Patent No. 5,808,866). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The claimed device for electromagnetically protecting a drawer containing electronics cards improves over conventional devices by uniquely providing drawer suitable for being inserted into a drawer-receiving structure through an opening provided in a front face of the drawer-receiving structure, the device including six faces distributed around the cards, where one of the faces of the device is formed by a front face of the drawer, while the five other faces of the device are formed by two side faces, a top face, a bottom face, and a back face of the drawer-receiving structure.

The secondary reference *Porter* does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of the primary reference. *Porter* also fails to teach or suggest a drawer, a drawer-receiving structure, or six

faces distributed around the cards in the drawer, where one face is formed by a front face of the drawer and the other five faces are formed by the sides, top, bottom, and back of the drawer-receiving structure, as claimed in claim 1.

Rather, *Porter* discloses (e.g., col. 13: lines 53-64) a container having a card cage with apertures that permit flow-through ventilation of air through the card cage, where the card cage has electronic circuit cards mounted therein.

The above-noted disclosure of *Porter* does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 that are discussed above as being absent from the *Brusati* reference. Since the applied references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, the present ground of rejection fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness. MPEP § 2143.03. In addition, since the applied references fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, the Examiner's statement of alleged motivation is inapposite.

Since the applied references fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations and since, accordingly, there would have been no motivation to have combined the references, Applicant respectfully requests the § 103 rejection of claims 4-10 be withdrawn. Claims 4-10 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1.

#### **Request for interview**


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly **requested to call** the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/628,442

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,  
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

  
John W. Bain  
Registration No. 42,283

Date: **July 3, 2001**